India

FOR THE

No. 187. New Series.] No. 281. Old Series.] WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, AUGUST 2, 1901. [Registered as a Newspaper. Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 49
Bases of the Budget 52
Our London Letter 53
Notes from Bombay 54
Chronicle of the Week... 54
The Bombay Land Revenue Bill: Telegram 56
The Famine in India 56
Letter to the Editor: Land Assessments and Middlemen 56
Reception to Dr. Mullick 57
Indian Tea Companies 58
Indian Affairs in Parliament 59
Advertisements 60

NOTES AND NEWS.

THE Viceroy's famine telegram this week still insists on an improvement of the prospect, which is attributed to "light and uncertain but general rain, much below the average." Every little helps, no doubt; yet it is admitted that the rainfall is not sufficient for the present stage in the Deccan, Gujerat, West Punjab, and part of Central India and Rajputana, where "sowing operations have been retarded." The exceptions from the general statement of efficiency are tolerably large. The numbers in receipt of relief have fallen to 556,000. In Bombay there were 39,000 fewer on works, but 6,000 more on gratuitous relief. Madras and the Central Provinces stand at the figures of a fortnight previously; and the Central Indian States have jumped up from 1,000 to 6,000 between July 13 and July 27. There is just a slight relaxation of the famine grip in Baroda and Hyderabad. The death-rate is keeping down below 2 per thousand, except in the Ahmednagar district, where the visitation is somewhat more severe. "Prices do not indicate apprehension." Yet one would welcome a more effective reduction of the figures.

The new land legislation of the Government of Bombay has raised widespread alarm, and evoked very keen criticism, throughout the Presidency. The correspondent of the "Times of India" who signs himself "J" and whose letters on Land Revenue have already attracted much attention, occupies three columns of the issue which has just come by the mail in a trenchant criticism of the proposals of the Government. He points out that by the close of the present financial year the arrears in the Bombay Presidency (exclusive of the Poona Zilla, for which the returns are not yet available) will amount to no less a sum than 133.4 lakhs of rupees or 46 per cent. of the total Land Revenue demand. The land of which the revenue is thus in arrear amounts to 92 lakhs of acres, or 33 per cent. of the occupied area of the Province. It is instructive to note that no such failure followed either the famine of 1876-77 or that of 1896-97, even though the former was preceded by four unfavourable seasons. "The extensive default during the last and current years is absolutely without precedent."

The Bombay Government now proposes to exact the penalty of forfeiture for these arrears, and to regrant the holdings to the defaulters under a new tenure. According to "J," the authorities consider the defaulting tenants thriftless and improvident. To grant them remissions would be to sacrifice revenue for the benefit of the money-lenders. It is better by an alteration of tenure, for which the great extent of the default gives an unparalleled opportunity, to place the peasants in such a position that "they would have no temptation and no power to ruin themselves by reckless borrowing." The "recklessness" of the borrowing, it will be observed, is calmly assumed; one would like to see the evidence of it. Moreover, though approved by high authorities, the policy of remissions "is altogether opposed to the fundamental principles of the Bombay survey." For it is an article of faith that under that survey the assessments are low, and ample allowance is made for occasional bad seasons.

"J" admits that there is something in this reasoning, but against it he marshals four arguments. First, the proposal is revolutionary, whatever its aim. Secondly, forfeiture is the "extreme" penalty for default, "to be enforced only in exceptional cases, and when every other process laid down in the code for the recovery of arrears has been tried and found ineffective." Thirdly, forfeiture for default where the offence is a result of misfortune—drought and crop-failure—is opposed to the declared principles of famine relief. The rayat's difficulty has been "adroitly converted into the official experimenter's opportunity." And fourthly, the rayat, for whose benefit the whole plan is professedly intended, will be the great sufferer. It is proposed to take away from him "his dearly cherished proprietary right in the soil as a penalty for default, and push him down to a lower platform of life." It is true he gets in return a discharge from his arrears, but his other liabilities remain, and can be enforced by proceedings in the Civil Courts, while his power to meet them is much reduced. "The 'sowcar' is well able to take care of himself: the rayat is helpless and suffers."

The new tenure is to be one of short leases without any power of transfer, and to create this tenure legislation is necessary. Hence the new Revenue Bill. Until this is passed, the penalty of forfeiture will not be enforced, and therefore there will probably be desperate efforts on the part of the threatened peasants to pay the arrears. But this can only be done by borrowing afresh. If the money-lender who already holds a mortgage on the holding pays, he will be entitled to add the amount to the debt already existing. If the rayat pays, he must borrow to do so. In either case his indebtedness will increase, and he will have to face the world, as he emerges from the time of famine, encumbered by a new load of debt.

The Bombay Land Revenue Amendment Bill has been reported on by the Select Committee to which it was referred. The Report of the Majority proposes some amendments which do not at all alter the principle of the Bill. But two members out of the six, Mr. G. K. Gokhale and Mr. S. A. Chhatre, present a Minority Report, directed against the Bill. One of the arguments they bring forward is rather important. The Government claim that, as the land of defaulters is already legally subject to forfeiture, there is no confiscation and no injustice in their proposals. But the Minority Report points out that under the existing law the power to forfeit is exercised to realise the assessment due. To this end, the land may be sold to the highest bidder; but if it realises more than the arrears, the excess must be paid to the defaulting occupant. It is only if no sale has been effected that the Government can dispose of the holding as they please. But here, the land of defaulters is not even to be offered for sale, and they therefore lose the chance of obtaining a surplus—the difference between the sale price and the amount of the arrears.

Meantime, the agitation against the Bill continues. Our Bombay correspondent, as will be seen in another column, reports a large and representative meeting in Bombay in condemnation of the Bill. The "Times of India" reports public meetings at Sholapore, Dhulia, Nandgaon, and elsewhere, at all of which strong resolutions of protest were carried. The Gujerat Sabha of Ahmedabad and the Deccan Sabha of Poona have forwarded to the Government long and earnest memorials on the same subject. The general burden of all the resolutions and memorials is the same: that the Bill fails to touch the real cause of the cultivator's embarrassments. The Ahmedabad memorial lays great stress on the danger of the cultivator losing his land altogether, if he has not the wherewithal on any occasion to pay the as-

sessment, since having now no security to offer he will be unable to borrow. The cultivators under the new tenure should at least be treated with less rigidity in the matter of land revenue collection, should be able in a good year to have sufficient for their wants after paying the assessment, and should as a matter of right be granted liberal remissions on a defined scale when the crops have totally or partially failed.

The District Magistrate of Rangoon lately convicted a clerk, secretary of the Buddhist Society at that place, a man of mixed Chinese and Burman race, named Kun Chwan, for insulting and trying to create a breach of the peace with Mr. Middleton, an English artist, who was painting on the Shwe Dagon Pagoda platform. The accused was sentenced to six months' rigorous imprisonment, and ordered at the expiration of that term to execute a bond for Rs. 100, with three sureties in the same amount, to keep the peace for a year, or in default to undergo one year's additional imprisonment. He appealed to the Sessions Court of the Pegu Division, but the Additional Sessions Judge dismissed the appeal, though he corrected an error of the magistrate by ordering that the imprisonment in default of finding securities should be simple instead of rigorous. Kun Chwan then appealed to the Chief Court at Rangoon, and Mr. Justice Fox reduced the sentence to one of four days' rigorous imprisonment, which the accused had already undergone. His bail was therefore discharged, and he was set at liberty.

Mr. Justice Fox declared his conviction that the occurrence did not spring from bad feelings towards Europeans. He said: "Considering, as I do, that Mr. Middleton was equally, if not more, to blame than the accused, the smallest nominal fine would have been an appropriate sentence." He considered that the case should never have been brought before a magistrate at all, and that the apology offered by the accused should have been accepted. The Judge regretted that the injustice done to Kun Chwan could not now be entirely remedied, as he had already suffered four days' imprisonment. It is, however, curious that he should have thought it necessary to record this sentence against him, when apparently even if an acquittal was impossible, a sentence of one day's imprisonment would have been sufficient.

There are, however, three points in the case which may bear some further consideration. The first is concerned with the motives attributed to the accused. Without any evidence, the magistrate found that the insult was a result of an organised plan, and that it was intended to create ill-feeling between Europeans and Burmans. Therefore, it was necessary to protect Europeans by an exemplary sentence. Secondly, Mr. Buckle, the Additional Sessions Judge, attributed the insult to "the insolent bluster of the educated Burman." Mr. Justice Fox declared that in this Mr. Buckle was guided by his feelings, and not by the facts. Thirdly, Mr. Justice Fox found one satisfactory feature in the conduct of the magistrate who originally tried the case. He recorded the evidence in full, and did not try it under his summary powers; so that in the end it was possible to redress the injustice done.

The London correspondent of the "Manchester Guardian" (July 26) understands that it has now been "practically settled that, even if the war is not over by the end of the year, Lord Kitchener will return to England in December, preparatory to going out to India to become Commander-in-Chief of the Army there, and that he will be succeeded in South Africa by General Neville Lyttelton." It might have been supposed that the Indian Army itself would be competent to provide a Commander-in-Chief —an officer familiar with India and with the special circumstances of the Army in India. Lord Kitchener, of course, is an able man, but he must spend a considerable part of his period of office before he can have his business at his finger ends as a Commander-in-Chief ought to have it. Only, we suppose, the interests of India must be made to fit in with the exigency of finding him his promotion.

The King has been graciously pleased to approve and ordain a new special Statute of the Most Eminent Order of the Indian Empire (July 24). Thereunder "the persons whom We may think fit to admit into the First, Second, and Third classes of the Most Eminent Order of the Indian Empire in consideration of their services rendered during the recent military operations in South Africa and China shall be Additional Members of the said Classes, and shall not now or hereafter be included within the number of the Ordinary Members allotted to such Classes." At the same time it is also ordained that "the Additional Members so to be appointed shall have rank and precedence among the Ordinary Members of their respective Classes according to the dates of their respective appointments." That is to say, the Special Statute is simply a device to extend for a special occasion the numbers of the various Classes, without altering the original limit.

Under the new Statute the following appointments have been made (July 24):

G.C.I.E.: Colonel Sir Alfred Gaselee, K.C.B., A.D.C.

K.C.I.E.: Major H. H. Maharaja Raj Rajeshwar Siromani, Sri Gunga Singh, Bahadur of Bikanir.

C.I.E.: Lieutenant-Colonel William J. R. Rainsford, R.A.M.C.; Lieutenant-Colonel Oswald C. Radford, I.S.C.; Lieutenant-Colonel George K. Scott-Moncrieff, R.E.; Major John J. C. Watson, R.A.M.C.; Captain and Bt.-Major Thomas E. Scott, D.S.O., I.S.C.; Lieutenant-Colonel Lawrance A. Waddell, I.M.S.; Lieutenant Asaf Ali Khan, Maler Kotla Sappers; Subadar Major Sardar Khan, Hong-Kong Regiment; Subadar Major Yasin Khan, 24th Bengal Infantry.

The foregoing appointments are made for services in China. For services in South Africa, Commander Gerald E. Holland, D.S.O., Royal Indian Marine, is made C.I.E.

The same day (July 24), Colonel George Lloyd Reilly Richardson, C.B., C.I.E., was made C.S.I. And at an Investiture held at St. James's Palace on Friday last (July 25), the K.C.I.E. was conferred on Mr. H. E. M. James, C.S.I., the well-known Commissioner of Sind; C.S.I. on Mr. John Ontario Miller; and C.I.E. on Colonel S. C. F. Peile, who has seen much service in the Police in Burma.

The desire to repress the Indian seeking his fortune in other British lands is again rampant in Australia. The Melbourne correspondent of the "Times" (July 29) reports that Mr. Barton has introduced a Bill into the Federal Parliament "to place restrictions on immigration, and to provide for the removal from the Commonwealth of prohibited immigrants." One might have supposed that most of the constituent territories of the Commonwealth were tolerably well supplied with legislation of this sort already, which, as we have pointed out on various occasions, does them and us so little credit. The Bill, we are told, contains "drastic provisions against the admission of persons who are idiots, insane, recently released criminals, persons likely to become paupers, or sufferers from infectious or contagious diseases." We have nothing to say against the self-protection of the Commonwealth from persons likely to be a burden or a nuisance; but we must renew our protest against the factitious exclusion of Indians under whatever other wider or plausible description. It will be easy enough for the officials to shut out all the poorer Indians as "persons likely to become paupers," and some other flexible expression will readily be found to bar the remainder.

The educational test, for example, is to be raised. Instead of requiring an Indian immigrant to write his name in English, the Federal Government wants to put him through an exercise in dictation: "any person who fails to write 50 words of the English language dictated by an immigration officer being prohibited." Will this immigration officer be a certified expert in penmanship and spelling? And will there be no appeal from his decisions? Besides, the immigrants may, even if they pass, be subjected to re-examination at any time during a twelvemonth after admission. Then "holders of exemption certificates are liable to have them cancelled at any time by a Minister." Exempt are the King's land and sea forces, the crews of vessels visiting the Commonwealth ports, and the wives and children accompanying husbands and fathers whose immigration is not prohibited. It will not be advisable for any one to run the blockade, for "unlawful entry by a prohibited immigrant renders him liable to six months' imprisonment or deportation." The usual discouragement of masters, owners, and charterers of vessels follows—a penalty of £100 for each prohibited immigrant

they introduce, or, in default of the payment, seizure of the vessel, with power to hold it in satisfaction of the claim. It is lamentable that the new Commonwealth should distinguish itself, among its very first acts, by such a gross exhibition of Anti-Imperialism, or selfishness.

The extension of facilities for a military career to the cadets of Native houses is accompanied by a certain extension of the volunteer system in India. "At all events," says the London correspondent of the "Manchester Guardian" (July 30), "the Secretary for India has given his sanction to the creation of the post of Inspector-General of Volunteers in India, solely on the understanding that this official will give his attention not only to the improvement of the organisation and equipment of the force, but will also give heed to the possibility of its increased strength." The appointment is professedly experimental, and to run for three years, but in military circles it is regarded as bound to be permanent. The creation of the post, it is added, "was explicitly advised by the Commander-in-Chief."

Sir Antony MacDonnell, speaking at Allahabad (July 29), reviewed the educational policy of the North-West Provinces during the past six years, and took occasion to give an authoritative contradiction to a statement made in the Bengal Press to the effect that the Government of India contemplated making the reading of the Bible compulsory in Government schools." Any such statement is so plainly contrary to the policy and practice of the Government that it may be said to be positively wicked. It ought not to need contradiction. Sir Antony, however, did well to arm himself with an express statement from the Home Secretary of the Government of India in these terms:—

I am desired to say that there has been no foundation for the statement that the Government of India has either taken steps to introduce the reading of the Bible into Government schools or asked the Local Government for their opinions as to the desirability of doing so. The Government of India approve his honour's intention of giving an authoritative contradiction to the statements which have been made to the above effect.

But there was another point. Sir Antony, the Allahabad correspondent of the "Times" goes on to say, referred pointedly to a recent speech delivered in England by the Bishop of Calcutta, "who has had small experience of India." That speech "has created an impression in these Provinces that in his lordship's opinion true loyalty and attachment to our rule in India are only to be found among the Native Christian subjects of the Crown." "From that view," said Sir Antony, "I desire with all the authority I possess to express absolute dissent." Now Bishop Welldon writes to the "Times" (July 31), suggesting that Sir Antony MacDonnell was misled by "an abbreviated report." It was a pity that the report, if wrong, was not set right at once. However, Dr. Welldon now says:—

No doubt I said at Oxford that, in the stress of the Mutiny, the Native Christians of India proved loyal to the Government. But to say that certain persons are loyal or that they possess in their religion a natural motive to loyalty is not to assert or imply that nobody else can be loyal. And I should be deeply sorry if any words of mine were taken, at this time especially, to impugn the loyalty of the Hindu and Mahomedan population of India to the Crown. For, in the speech to which the Lieutenant-Governor, I think, refers, I dwelt upon the wonderful manifestation of feeling all over India at the death of the late Queen-Empress.

The "Investors' Review" comments strongly on the recent correspondence between Mr. William Digby and Sir Antony MacDonnell. It says (July 27):—

Mr. Digby does not draw on his imagination for his facts, but marshals together official statements—statements most damning and significant. All the answer that Sir Antony MacDonnell has to give him is smooth generalities and a string of unsupported . . . . accusations against the people . . . . And the Government of India is evidently afraid to let the truth be known. Lord George Hamilton promised that weekly statistics, relating to the famine relief camps, would be given to the country, and kept his promise for a few weeks; then silence again fell, and last week we only received some general statement about the inadequacy of the rainfall, statements sinister enough, but not what was promised or required. Is the hunger spreading again to an extent which makes the bureaucrats of Simla terrified to let the truth be known?

The carters and garrywallas of Calcutta lately struck work as a protest against the extortions to which they were subjected by the Police. The inconvenience caused by the strike has led the heads of the police to attack corruption in the force with great zeal. One constable has not only been dismissed the force, but according to the "Amrita Bazar Patrika" has been sentenced to pay a fine of Rs. 25, or in default to undergo ten days' rigorous imprisonment for receiving a bribe of one pice from a ticca garry-driver. Moreover, a sergeant of the Mounted Police and a constable are now under trial charged with receiving a monthly allowance of one rupee each from a garry-walla, who at last informed the superintendent.

A correspondent writes to the "Times" to announce a project, the details of which he says are still under consideration, "to familiarize the people of India with the features of his Majesty the King [why not "Emperor" in this connexion?], and to symbolize the fact that all authority, judicial and executive, is exercised in his name." New coins with the Emperor's presentment will take long to circulate—a remarkable indirect testimony to the poverty of the country—and so the Government of India, it is said, "have decided to provide all official residences and buildings with 'suitable' likenesses of his Majesty." The people, then, are supposed to be more familiar with official residences and buildings than with the current coin of the realm! There will be three classes of portraits: (1) three-quarters length in oils, costing £50 to £75 apiece; (2) smaller size also in oils, costing £30 to £50 each; and (3) coloured lithographs, or engravings, for the ordinary court and cutcherries. "It is pointed out that to duly impress the populace the portraits should represent the King in robes of State or in Field-Marshal's uniform, since the conception of an Emperor in the attire of a private gentleman is foreign to them." We will put our money on the Field-Marshal's uniform. Apparently they will have to pay the costs of their education in this matter. How did her late Majesty's portrait circulate?

There has been laid on the table of the House of Commons, on the motion of Sir Seymour King, certain correspondence between the Government of India and the Secretary of State on the subject of memorials submitted to the Indian Government by officers of the Public Works Department appointed from Cooper's Hill in 1873-78. These memorials make claims for compensation on account of the non-fulfilment of the promises alleged to have been made to the memorialists before entering the College. The claims are: (1) adequate compensation for depreciation of currency; (2) payment of pensions in sterling at 2s. per rupee; and (3) adequate compensation for loss suffered on account of slow promotion. Further, those that joined the service in 1878, and therefore entered the College in 1875, also pray (4) that they may be allowed the privilege, which was conceded to men of the years previous to 1878, of drawing their furlough allowances when paid in England at the rate of 2s. to the rupee. The Secretary of State negatives all the prayers of the memorialists, and snubs the Government of India for "the grave inconvenience of the course followed by your Government in dealing with this matter."

We are glad to observe the name of Miss Elizabeth Maclagan Wedderburn, daughter of Sir William Wedderburn, highly placed in the newly-issued lists of the Final Honour School of Modern History at the University of Oxford. Only one lady obtained a first-class; and Miss Wedderburn stood second of the ladies in the second class. She has been a student in Somerville College.

Remittances on India for ten lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and applications were received for Rs. 170,50,000 in bills at 1s. 3d. and 29-32nds, and 1s. 3d. and 15-16ths. The following amounts were allotted:—Rs. 4,65,000 on Calcutta and Rs. 3,48,000 on Madras at an average rate of 1s. 3.906d. and Rs. 1,87,000 on Bombay at an average of 1s. 3.908d. Tenders at 1s. 3d. and 29-32nds received about six per cent. Later the Council made a special sale of Rs. 40,000 in bills on Madras at 1s. 3d. and 15-16ths. Last week remittances for Rs. 20,20,000 were sold for £133,877, making the total disposed of from April 1 to Tuesday night Rs. 690,23,556, producing £4,578,868. Next week the amount to be offered will be raised to 20 lakhs.

BASES OF THE BUDGET.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON, as will be seen from our Parliamentary Report, is not yet able to fix a date for the Indian Budget, and he "does not think it will be possible"—but does not say why—to issue the Report of the Famine Commission by the time the Budget comes on. This is not unexpected, but it is very unfortunate; for the Report of the Famine Commission will certainly have important bearings on the general situation. Already, at different times, we have commented on some of the main points that must arise on the so-called "debate" on the Indian Budget—especially on the alleged "recuperative power" of India, the projected expenditure on military "requirements" and public works, the weakness of the cotton, tea, and indigo industries, and the causes, conditions, results, and future treatment of the famine. But a courageous document like Sir Edward Law's Financial Statement is not readily exhausted. For instance, it would be a rewarding exercise to put Lord George Hamilton through a course of catechizing on the grounds of the "very gratifying" fact "that in spite of all the troubles of the past year, every main head of receipts, except Land Revenue, shows a more or less important increase." Even if such increase were solid and trustworthy as a test of prosperity, one would still have to remember that, over such a wide stretch of territory and under such various conditions, a general increase might easily consist with a dangerous declension in a particular area, which might be an area of very considerable dimensions. The mere fact that Sir Edward Law is in a position to point to "a more or less important increase" in all the main receipts except one "in spite of the troubles of the past year"—troubles of an unparalleled famine, plague, and the horrors in their train—ought to be enough to put our statesmen on enquiry.

The income and the expenditure of an Empire necessarily have flows and ebbs, and in an Empire like India one cannot reasonably expect only moderate and certain fluctuations; but the estimates of the year indicate disquieting movements. The receipts of the Revised Estimates show an increase of over half a million—£572,000—under Opium; the Budget Estimate is taken at £589,300 less. Why this violent fluctuation? Because "it would not be prudent to count on the continuation of the abnormally high prices which have lately prevailed." The increase of the year, then, seems to rest on an accident. The recent course of the opium revenue impresses caution. The yield of 1897-98 was less than half the yield of 1894-95, and less than a third of the yield of 1880-81. In 1897-98 the official statement was that "the opium harvest has for eight successive seasons been much below the average of former years." The harvest, however, is but one side of the matter; the foreign demand has also to come into the reckoning. Apart from the moral considerations involved, it seems high time that some other basis of revenue were discovered, more stable and solid than opium. An advance of £106,000 is set down to Salt, and said to be "due to increasing consumption" everywhere except in Burma. The distribution of the increase is rather remarkable. It is surely very strange that, in a time of famine that has devastated Bombay so widely, the increase of the salt revenue should stand out larger in Bombay than in Bengal and Madras together, while the increase in the Northern India Salt Department, which controls the salt sources of the Punjab and of Rajputana, and supplies such famine areas as the Central Provinces and Rajputana, is heavier than the increase in Madras or even in Bengal. If we remember rightly the salt revenue fell not much less than Rx. 500,000 under the stress of the famine of 1896-97. Can it be that famine has now become a specific for improving the consumption of salt? And have we not heard of the constitutional mischief caused to both man and beast during the famine by reason of the very want of sufficient salt? There seems much room for authoritative explanation on this point. For salt, too, there has long been pressing the need for some partial, if not complete, substitute in the system of taxation; everybody has been, and is, ashamed of it.

The Excise revenue has shown more steadiness over a number of years, though it is open to doubt whether an increase of £138,000 last year can be taken to indicate a real improvement in the country, helpful as it is immediately to the finances. It means more drinking; and more drinking does not necessarily imply increased vigour of the drinkers' constitutions, or increased distention of their purses either. We daresay, however, that in spite of all temperance agencies it is, like enlarged public debts, a recognised concomitant of the progress of "civilisation." One would gladly see some substitute here also—a substitute that would indicate with certainty a real progress of the country going hand in hand with steady increases in the returns to the treasury. The increase of £190,000 in Customs is regarded at Calcutta as "a certain sign of consuming capacity, and therefore of progressive well-being." It would be so indeed if the conditions of India were normal. But they are not normal. The articles on which customs are levied are some way from corresponding with the natural wants of the people. The policy of the Government has been a disturbing element, and is likely to continue such. What becomes of the "certain sign of consuming capacity and of progressive well-being" when the Budget estimate is reduced by £136,100—going very near to extinguish the increase, which is yet exhibited to the public as a "certain sign" of improvement? Is there a latent ambiguity in the word "certain"? Now, we are told that "the most important variation in detail" in this figure is "a lower estimate for imports of Sugar, the duties on the extraordinarily large importation of which have abnormally swelled our receipts during the past year." There has been a factitious increase, then, and yet its figures are represented as a "certain sign." We confess we should like to see business developing in a more natural way, so as to impress a firm feeling of solidity in the operations of industry and commerce, and in the financial arrangements.

From Telegraphs came an increase of £86,000, which looks healthy for internal development. But the explanation of the improvement again reveals the opportuneness of accident. The increase is stated to be due "partly to exceptional circumstances connected with famine, and partly to the increasing demand for news owing to the wars in South Africa and China, and the fatal illness of the late Queen-Empress." The advantage to the treasury, then, results, in the main at least, from threefold calamity; and again the famine is found to compensate in some degree for its inroads elsewhere on the finances. It is not easy to induce a frame of mind that can contemplate such grounds of improvement with placid satisfaction. But Sir Edward Law finds the increase "very gratifying"—of course, from the Budget standpoint purely, though we should hope that Parliament will look beyond that exigency and see whether a larger advantage might not be reaped by practically stopping famines altogether. In like manner, the Railway receipts ran up nearly a million—£965,000—"partly due to the large movement of food stuffs for famine requirements and partly to increased mileage and general development." The famine requirements are only too obvious; we wish we could say the same for the "general development." Here, then, is another million largely due to the ravages of famine. Really, it must be about time to see whether the treasury cannot be reinforced in some fashion more consonant with general prosperity than a calamity of the first magnitude. Even the Irrigation increase of £208,000 must be partly attributed to distress, for the receipts "necessarily fluctuate with the increase or decrease of the demands of the agriculturists for water, and are higher in bad seasons." But, then, that is just what irrigation is there for, and the situation is natural, though much may still be done by judicious irrigation for the prevention of those crushing and destructive famines. The increase of £130,000 under Military Department Receipts is acknowledged to be "purely fortuitous," representing "the value of Military stores sent abroad and debited to the Home Government." The difficulty is that so much of this catalogue of £2,395,000 of receipts is so fortuitous, and fortuitous in such painful ways.

On the other hand, "the severity and prolongation of famine" accounts for the one great deficiency—£382,900 in Land Revenue. Still the Financial Minister is sanguine enough to expect from the Land Revenue "£474,800 more than last year." He depends on "improved prospects throughout the greater part of India"—a sufficiently

vague ground for a great hope. Yet he cannot venture to omit a saving clause: "until we are sure of a favourable monsoon, the most moderate estimates may be suddenly and hopelessly falsified." Well, that is so; and one must recognise the tightness of his corner. Unhappily, since he made his statement, the monsoon has not proved so favourable as to realise his expectations; and probably he will soon come to modify his reliance on the monsoon. Unless reafforestation is effectively proceeded with, it is difficult to see how the monsoon is to be caught for the agriculturist—and for the Finance Minister. Till then, one must take one's chance, and the finances must always be liable to be upset. Is there not a cogent argument here for some serious attempt to rehabilitate the rayat? Not only by reafforestation, but by lightening his revenue load, by rescuing him from the sowkar (or whatever other lender at hopeless interest), say by agricultural banks, by finding out (as the Famine Union wants to do) the precise spot where the shoe pinches him, and the force of the pinch, by some practical measures for the improvement of agriculture, and so forth. Is there no one in Parliament to give the proper answer to Lord George Hamilton's counsel of despair? Is it forgotten here—it is not forgotten in India—that he declared the prevention of famine to be impossible for Parliament? He said (January 26, 1897): "Famines are terrible and inevitable incidents. I think it is a mistake, and is wrong, for any member of this House to hold out the hope that any remedies which he can suggest can prevent famines in India." This hasty utterance we venture to hope he will recall. Meantime, the rayat can be sustained by an adequate National Grant. But, even supposing every stringent saving in expenditure, it seems obvious that there is an urgent necessity for a drastic revision and strengthening of the bases of the Indian Budget.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

Westminster, Thursday.

A marked feature of yesterday's debate in the House of Commons on the proposed grant of £100,000 to Lord Roberts for his services in South Africa was the tameness of the whole proceeding. Mr. Balfour was by turns apologetic and hyperbolical, while Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman damned with faint praise. The denunciations of the Irish members, too, were more violent than forcible. One of the most effective debating points was Mr. Dillon's citation of Mr. Chamberlain as a witness against the Commander-in-Chief. Twenty-two years ago a document was circulated protesting against the methods of warfare employed by General Roberts in Afghanistan. Among others who signed the protest, according to Mr. Dillon, were Mr. Chamberlain and the then Archbishop of Canterbury. The Colonial Secretary heard the charge, and did not question its truth.

Owing, perhaps, to the friendly attitude of the Liberal leaders in relation to the grant many members did not think it worth their while to take part in the division. About 350 members voted, the proposal being carried by a majority of just over two hundred. Mr. Caine acted as one of the tellers against the motion, and as many as seventeen Liberals voted in the minority. One front-bench Liberal, Mr. Edmund Robertson, took this course, and so did Sir F. Mappin, Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. John Burns, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Bryn-Roberts, and Mr. Thomas Bayley. The motion, like almost every other piece of controversial business this Session, had in the end to be forced through by means of the closure.

Responsibility for the disorderly scenes of the week does not rest entirely on the Nationalist members. The Ministerialists were partly to blame for the first outbreak. Following their custom they began on Monday night to shout down every speaker on the Opposition side with clamorous cries of "Divide," and "Agreed." The Nationalists retaliated by calling "Police." Eventually the Speaker implored the Ministerialists to give members a hearing, and directed the Nationalists to refrain from disorderly interruption. The Ministerialists below the gangway immediately redoubled their clamour, whereupon Mr. William Redmond, turning pointedly in the direction of the Speaker, shouted "Police" at the pitch of his voice. There was something farcical in the whole incident, but it did not end till the member for Clare and also Mr. Patrick O'Brien, one of the Nationalist Whips, had been named for defying the authority of the Chair, and suspended from their Parliamentary duties for the remainder of the week.

A renewal of the disorder was witnessed at the very next sitting of the House. Mr. Balfour, replying to an appeal by Mr. John Redmond, had declined to promise facilities for the consideration of a motion impugning the conduct of the Lord Chief Justice of Ireland. The refusal brought up Mr. O'Shea, a mild-mannered solicitor, with an observation which was evidently intended to be the exordium to a volume of reminiscences. "As one who was present," he began, "may I ask how long this judicial blackguardism—." Much to his surprise the hon. member was interrupted at this point by the Speaker, and directed to withdraw his little prelude. The proud author declined, and thereupon was named, suspended, and cast into outer darkness, protesting that he was of the same opinion still. Many of his compatriots echoed Mr. O'Shea's words, with decorative additions of their own, but for the moment the Speaker averted his avenging hand.

Unhappily, those incidents have a more sinister significance than appears on the surface. They betoken an unhealthy state of feeling, dangerous alike to the corporate sentiment of the House of Commons and to its efficiency as an instrument of legislation. The Nationalists have laboured under a bitter sense of injustice and resentment ever since the ill-omened night when the police were summoned within the bar to expel certain members of their party by force. As the end of the Session draws near apprehension of growing disorder is quickened, and it is certainly not rendered less acute by the provocative conduct of some of Mr. Balfour's followers.

"We are the slaves of euphony," says Lord Salisbury, and that, curiously enough, is his reason for preferring as a Royal title "King of the British dominions beyond the seas" to Lord Rosebery's alternative suggestion of "King of all the Britains beyond the seas." Lord Rosebery finds a precedent for this "strange and even uncouth title," as Lord Salisbury calls it, in the inscription on some of the coinage of the late Queen, "Britanniarum Regina," and an analogy in the Czar's style of Emperor of all the Russias. "But you must be euphonious," says Lord Salisbury. "If your title is not euphonious it is very soon set aside." Does the Prime Minister imagine that people in future are going to speak of the King as Britt. Rex, Fid. Def., Ind. Imp., and all the rest of it?

Whatever style is adopted it must of course be purely for ceremonial use, and euphony can have little to do with it. Nevertheless, people generally are thankful that Mr. Chamberlain's first suggestion of "King of Greater Britain," with its flavour of sentimental journalism, was dropped as soon as made. It should be noted, by the way, that while Lord Salisbury appears to be under the impression that the Colonial Secretary is still in communication with the colonies on the subject, the correspondence itself shows that Mr. Chamberlain broached the matter within a week of the late Queen's death, and that everything was apparently settled five months ago.

Once again the War Office is at daggers drawn with the patriots of the Press. In this case, however, Mr. Brodrick denies that his adversary is a patriot. "This journal," he informed the House of Commons, the other night, "has published statements based on secret official documents, which in each instance had previously been refused by other newspapers on patriotic grounds." The practice of which Mr. Brodrick complains may be, as he says, a disgrace to the public service, and also a danger to the country, but his methods of punishment are open to criticism. To deprive the offending newspaper of the ordinary official information of the day seems a futile as well as a petty kind of retribution. There is certainly a greater dignity in Mr. Edmund Robertson's suggestion that proceedings should be taken under the Official Secrets Act. Dignity, on the other hand, is the last word by which one would describe the proceedings of last Tuesday, when after unanimously declaring that the offending journal had been guilty of a breach of privilege the House of Commons, at the instigation of a Government, declined to pursue the matter further.

Mr. Lowther's gout promises s one of the his-

toric events of the Session. This inopportune ailment, if Mr. Balfour is to be believed, not only incapacitated the Chairman of Committees, but threatened to paralyse the whole machinery of Parliamentary administration. The patient had to be brought from his room to the table of the House of Commons, in order that the discussion on the Education Bill might be closured. In rescuing that feeble measure from the grave, Mr. Lowther appears to have aggravated his own sufferings. At all events he has not been in his place since, and fears are now entertained lest he should be unable to come down towards the end of the Session and closure the remaining votes in Supply. As these number nearly a hundred, the prospect is somewhat disquieting. Mr. Balfour's faith in the closure is so great that he has allowed arrears of business to accumulate in the sanguine expectation that when the time came two days' work with the guillotine would dispose of everything. But what is to happen if the executioner cannot ply the axe? The Session, in that event, might be prolonged for an indefinite period.

Though the Session is still in progress, the season is indisputably at an end. In former years the Session and season were synchronous and synonymous. They were regarded as one and indivisible, whereas now there is scarcely a point of contact between them. If the Thames would submerge the terrace and keep it submerged the last link would be gone, and from one point of view it would be an excellent consummation. Meanwhile, the prorogation of Covent Garden is an accomplished fact, and Goodwood, the epilogue of the season, is nearing its close. Most of the theatres have put up the shutters, and the West-end is going into deshabille. Fashionable people profess to be glad that the dullest season of modern times is now a mere retrospect. The festivities of the Coronation give them something to look forward to in the coming year, with its programme of Imperial processions, State balls, State concerts, State performances in theatre and opera-house, and all the other gaieties appropriate to the birth of a new era.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

Bombay, July 13.

Our Bengal friends have lately been busy with their representation to the Government of India on the question of police reform. I have in a previous letter referred to this subject, which is no doubt the theme in the columns of almost the whole of the leading press in India. From the "Pioneer" downwards this reform has been clamoured for from time to time, but we have never yet witnessed it. Lord Curzon's big problems have gone their way without achieving anything sound, practical, and permanent. Those problems have vanished after the manner of the magician's prestidigitation. The juggler seems to have made soap bubbles of them. And we have heard nothing more. But surely, next only to the question of land reform is this reform of the police. People are in the habit of saying that they only know two things in the country: firstly, that they are official-ridden; and, secondly, they are police-ridden. But the vagaries of the higher officials may be tolerated. Not so those of the police, which are intolerable and exasperating. The Indian Association has just submitted to the Imperial authorities a well-reasoned and practical memorial, suggesting where reforms could be made, which it is to be hoped will receive the attention it deserves at the hands of Lord Curzon's Government.

Another event of the week is the conclusion of the labours of the Railway Conference. This is an annual meeting where the high railway officials discuss technical questions. Now we have no desire to underrate the importance of them; but it is most extraordinary that while the railways without the people would be nowhere, the interests of the people are never discussed at this annual assemblage. It seems that in the matter of railways, from the point of view of the people, the people are an utterly negligible quantity. As they say that the people exist for the Army in India, so it might be said with absolute truth that they also exist for the railways, instead of the railways existing for them. From time to time we read in the columns of the Press many a grievance, here, there, and everywhere, of railway passengers who are mostly of the third class. But it is seldom that we ever hear of a grievance being attended to. Such a thing would never happen in England. Chronic grievances would take such body and form by way of agitation as to force the railway officials there to give due attention at once to the complaints. The Board of Trade would intervene. But in India, of course, they manage differently. So long as the official classes, constantly travelling by railway, are kept in a comfortable frame of mind, the millions of Native passengers who alone contribute to enrich the coffers of the companies and the State to the annual tune of well-nigh 8 crores may go to the dogs. There is next to nothing as yet for the convenience and comfort of these, specially for those of the female sex. Third-class passengers are simply treated like herds of sheep and no more. They are not supposed to have any intelligence and they have no tongues to talk of their many grievances. Thus, so far as the wants and wishes of those who contribute most to the railway treasury, the annual conference is a failure. The cry only of the foreign merchant and the vested interests is heard and attended to.

The Land Alienation Bill of Bombay has evoked universal protest. The volume of hostile criticism against the hasty and ill-advised measure is swelling. Protests and representations are the order of the day; and it is evident that the Bill will have to run the gamut of the trenchant criticism of all the popular representatives in the Council. The Deccan Sabha suggested its abandonment, and the Presidency Association its postponement. To the well-reasoned representation of the first the Government has hastened to give a reply, which has for its main object the allaying of the panic which has naturally seized the large mass of land holders and cultivators. That the Government should have taken this somewhat unusual step at this early stage to reply to the Sabha is an indication of its desire to respect public opinion. In all probability such a desire has its origin with the head of the Government. We all know that Lord Northcote, sympathetic as he is, is desirous of hearing Native opinion and pacifying it, if need be. And so far we all feel thankful to his Excellency for this kind step. At the same time it should be observed that the reply is in no way of a reassuring character. The language is studiously framed and moderate. There is none of the secretariat snubbing to which some representatives of old of the Sarvajanik Sabha (now alas a grievous wreck) were subjected. The tone and temper of the letter is unexceptionable. All the same there is a complete disappointment at its contents. The poison of the Bill is still there. The antidote offered in the reply is altogether inefficacious. The author of the letter remarks that the "principle" of the Bill is left untouched by the Sabha. This is extraordinary. For the principle is the very thing on which that body has aimed all its heaviest shafts. It is openly attacked. To this attack there has been no rejoinder from the Government side. On the contrary, it has been almost wholly silent on it. The whole question hinges on this one point: Is or is not the Bill intended to upset the present system of land tenure in the Presidency, and substitute in its place, gradually, of course, direct and absolute State landlordism? This is the mischievous and revolutionary part of it. And it will not do to evade this query by raising other subsidiary and unimportant issues. The reply of the Government here is nowhere. Meanwhile agitation is growing apace. Some prominent citizens have sent a requisition to the Presidency Association to call a public meeting to protest against the Bill. It is very likely it will be held in about a week or ten days. And it is to be presumed the meeting will have the opportunity not only to give a rejoinder to the Government reply to the Sabha, but to openly challenge it whether or not it contemplates abolishing the rayat, making him an agricultural serf, and substituting State landlordism. We shall see.

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

Thursday, July 25.—In the House of Commons Mr. Chamberlain, in answer to questions by Sir W. Harcourt and Sir Charles Dilke regarding the Native labour laws in the Transvaal, said that the minimum penalties under the Pass Law had been abolished, and magistrates might now inflict as small a punishment as they thought fit. The Government had the amendment of the Gold and Pass Laws under consideration. Lord Milner was in favour of very strict limitation of the penalty of flogging, if not its ultimate abolition, except for brutal crimes, and he had

been requested to take the earliest opportunity after his return to deal with the whole subject. In answer to Mr. Labouchere and Captain Pirie, who put a number of questions concerning the compulsory attendance of colonial subjects at the execution of Cape rebels, Mr. Brodrick said he did not think it would be necessary to give Lord Kitchener any advice in the matter. There had only been one case, so far as he was aware, in which burghers were obliged to attend the execution of a rebel, and he understood there were exceptional circumstances in that case. He imagined that the object intended to be gained by the attendance of a few persons who were themselves disloyal was to deter them from bringing themselves within reach of the law.

An official despatch from Lord Kitchener issued by the War Office stated that on Sunday the mounted troops of Major Garratt's column surprised a Boer convoy near Reitzburg, capturing 25 prisoners and some waggons. Two officers and six men were wounded. Major Garratt kept in touch with the enemy on Monday, and then returned to the line to hand over his captures. Reitzburg is a small town in the Orange River Colony, on the southern bank of the Vaal, and on the main road between Kroonstad and Potchefstroom. In Cape Colony, Lord Kitchener further stated, General French is gradually pushing the enemy northwards.

The King received at Marlborough House the foreign delegates to the Congress on Tuberculosis. He expressed his regret that he had been prevented by the demands on his time from presiding at the opening of the Congress, and from attending the meetings, for he was deeply interested in its work. He also earnestly hoped that something might soon be done to arrest the second great scourge—cancer. The chief subject of discussion at the Congress was Dr. Koch's theory that tuberculous disease is not transmissible from cattle to human beings; his view was generally doubted.

In response to the appeal recently made by Mr. Chamberlain as Chancellor of the University of Birmingham, the General Purposes Committee of the Birmingham City Council have decided to recommend that an annual grant be made to the University in aid of the technical and manual instruction carried on therein equivalent to the amount which would be raised by a rate of one halfpenny in the pound—about £5,750.

Friday, July 26.—In the House of Lords, Lord Salisbury presented a Bill for altering the Royal Title. He stated that the Colonies agreed that the change was desirable. The Bill would leave it to the King himself to decide the new form of title. It would enact "that it should be lawful for his gracious Majesty with the view to the recognition of his Majesty's dominions beyond the seas by his Royal proclamation under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom, issued within six months after the passing of this Act, to make such additions to the style and title of the Sovereign of the United Kingdom and its dependencies, as to his Majesty may seem fit." He said that probably the title would be "Edward the Seventh, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and of all the British dominions beyond the seas, King, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India." Lord Spencer confessed that, though he objected to the title of Empress of India in 1876, he now thought that the change had produced a profound effect in India, and was exceedingly popular. Without expressing any serious objection to the present proposal, he regarded it as somewhat singular that the new style should not be actually recapitulated or described in the Bill itself. The Bill was read a first time.

The Queen Victoria Memorial Committee accepted Mr. Brock's design for the memorial, which is to be set up in front of Buckingham Palace. There was an exhibition of the preliminary sketches and plans.

Mr. Balfour, addressing the Eastern Division of the National Union of Conservative Associations, lamented the weakness of the Opposition, regarding it as a public inconvenience that might develop into a public danger. He could discern no alternative at present to the existing Government such as could command any measure of public confidence. He also remarked that a large majority did not enable an administration to carry on the work of the nation more expeditiously. He maintained, however, that the Government could not have done more than they had done, whether in domestic or in foreign affairs, and that no Liberal Government could have accomplished so much as the present Government had actually achieved.

The Congress on Tuberculosis closed its sittings. It passed a number of resolutions summing up the conclusions arrived at, the first of which dealt with the danger to public health from the habit of spitting, and insisted that "indiscriminate spitting should be suppressed."

Major-General Baden-Powell arrived at Southampton, and was accorded a very warm reception.

The Mono-rail Bill, proposing the construction of a railway between Manchester and Liverpool on a new principle, involving a great increase of speed, passed a Committee of the House of Commons.

Saturday, July 27.—Correspondence between Mr. Chamberlain and the principal Colonial Governors on the proposed alteration of the King's Title was published in a Parliamentary Paper. In his first communication to the Governor-General of Canada, Mr. Chamberlain suggested "King of Great Britain and Ireland and of Greater Britain beyond the Seas." None of the Colonies, however, approved of "Greater Britain," preferring "British Dominions" or "British Realms beyond the Seas."

The War Office published a report received from Lord Kitchener containing specific evidence as to the shooting of wounded British soldiers by Boers at Vlakfontein. It gives statements made by Lieutenant Hern, of the Imperial Yeomanry, and by several non-commissioned officers and privates, to the effect that, while lying wounded on the field after the action, they saw Boers shoot their wounded comrades. One man is specially mentioned as active in the horrible work, Piet Forster, said to be a German, who speaks English well. The Report says that "several of the men state that they saw a Boer, evidently someone in authority, trying to stop his men from shooting our wounded."

Lord Kitchener also reported that a detachment of Steinacker's Horse, which occupied Bremersdorp in Swaziland, were compelled on Wednesday last to evacuate the place by a superior force of Boers. The detachment fought their way to Lembobo, a distance of 16 miles, with the loss of ten men killed and wounded, and a few missing.

Mr. Barton, in answer to a question in the Australian Federal House of Representatives, stated that the Government fully sympathised with the desire for the exclusive employment of white labour on board mail steamers, but that the Imperial Government refused to consent to the prohibition of the employment of Lascars. The Government of India also favoured the employment of Lascars. Mr. Barton has introduced a Bill containing drastic restrictions on immigration, and providing for the expulsion of prohibited immigrants from the Commonwealth of Australia.

The New German Tariff Bill, it was reported, imposes duties on agricultural produce beyond the amount that the Agrarians hoped for or the Liberals feared. It is severely criticised by all the journals of Free Trade leanings.

Russia, it was stated, agreed to withdraw for the present her proposal for an increase in the Chinese tariff beyond 5 per cent. as a reserve security, on the understanding that, in case of insufficiency of the assigned sums, the Powers will agree to consider what other revenues shall be added.

Dr. Westcott, Bishop of Durham, died at Auckland Castle, Bishop Auckland, in his 77th year.

Monday, July 29.—In the House of Commons a message was read from the King recommending the House to concur in granting to Earl Roberts the sum of £100,000 in recognition of his eminent services in South Africa. Mr. Brodrick stated that on two occasions in the present year the London "Daily Mail" had published statements on impending events based on secret official documents. In each case the information had been refused on patriotic grounds by another journal. On the last occasion, which occurred last week, he intimated to the editor that this practice must cease, and that unless he could give the War Office the means of detecting the leakage they must take such steps as they could to protect the country from the effect of premature and inaccurate disclosures. If there was any case in which he could take action under the Official Secrets Act he would take it.

In the House of Lords Lord Rosebery gave notice that he would at the proper time move that the Royal Declaration Bill be referred to a Select Committee. The Premier moved the second reading of the Royal Titles Bill, and pointed out, with regard to the objection urged by Earl Spencer to the effect that the exact title was not set out in the Bill, that the Government had followed the only precedent they had—namely, that of the Indian title. He indicated that it was quite possible that some slight change might still have to be made. Lord Rosebery suggested that in the phrase "Of all the British dominions beyond the seas King" the word "Britains" should be substituted for "British dominions." Lord Salisbury said that, as at present advised, he did not think it would be possible to adopt Lord Rosebery's suggestion. The second reading was agreed to.

The House of Commons Committee on Trade concluded its prolonged labours on the Factory Acts Consolidation Bill. The Bill was described as a "monumental" measure. It consolidates the provisions of the Factory and Workshop Acts of 1878, 1883, 1889, and 1895, and the Cotton Cloth Factories Acts of 1889 and 1897. On the motion of the Home Secretary, the Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment Bill, which has been under the consideration of the Committee for some weeks, was incorporated in the Bill. The Bill was ordered to be reported to the House.

A telegram from Consul-General Sadler at Berbera announced that Colonel Swayne had driven back the Somaliland Mullah with heavy loss into the Mijertain country after severe fighting. The enemy were pursued into the Haud, when the pursuit was abandoned, owing to the enemy having scattered in every direction. Captain Friedrichs was killed in attempting to rescue a wounded non-commissioned officer, and Lieutenant Dickinson received a severe flesh wound in the thigh.

Tuesday, July 30.—In the House of Commons, the Education (No. 2) Bill was read a third time, in the face of earnest Liberal opposition, by 200 to 142.

A Parliamentary paper was issued giving details of a Supplementary Estimate for just over £7,000,000. Of this amount £6,500,000 is a grant in aid of the revenues of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony for the year ending March next.

The report of their Committee presented at the annual meeting of the Federation of Master Cotton Spinners' Associations held yesterday in Manchester showed that during the year ended June 30 last there has been an increase both in the membership and in the number of spindles held by the members. The spindles number 20,068,678, an increase for the year of 1,720,763.

A long despatch from Lord Kitchener stated that since July 22 the columns report 24 Boers killed, 25 wounded, 223 prisoners, and 80 surrenders. There have also been captured 184 rifles, 10,850 rounds of small-arm ammunition, 205 waggons, 2,700 horses, and a large quantity of stock.

Wednesday, July 31.—In the House of Commons, on going into Committee of Supply to consider the King's Message relat-

ing to the proposed grant to Lord Roberts of Kandahar, Mr. Balfour moved that a sum of £100,000 be granted to the Commander-in-Chief in recognition of his eminent services in the war in South Africa. Mr. Dillon opposed the grant. Mr. Balfour moved and obtained the closure, and the grant was carried by 281 votes against 73.

A Bloemfontein message stated that the Boers were being driven westwards by General Plumer's column (which left Bloemfontein last week), and that heavy gun fire was heard in the direction of Boshof on Sunday and Monday. The same message explained that the Dassiespoort where Myburgh's commando was so severely handled is between Bloemfontein and Fauresmith.

Another revolution has broken out in Venezuela, and complications with Columbia are feared.

THURSDAY, August 1.—Lady Hilda Brodrick, the wife of the Secretary of State for War, died this morning after a short illness.

THE BOMBAY LAND REVENUE BILL.

GREAT MEETING IN BOMBAY TO PROTEST.

WIDESPREAD ALARM AND MISTRUST.

On Monday (July 29) we received from our Bombay correspondent the following telegram:—

"A crowded public meeting was held on Saturday last in the Town Hall, Bombay, under the presidency of Mr. Pherozeshah M. Mehta, late Member of the Viceroy's Legislative Council, to discuss the land revenue legislation recently introduced into the Governor's Council. Besides representative men of the City of Bombay, there were present seven hundred delegates from all parts of the Presidency, most of them representatives of the real agricultural classes. Resolutions were passed exposing the true drift of the new land revenue measure introduced by the Government and its disastrous revolutionary character. Its real effect will be to destroy the established land settlement of the Bombay Presidency, under which land is at present heritable and transferable property, held in perpetuity on payment of the assessment, and no survey land can be occupied otherwise. It was shown that the proposal of the Government will substitute tenancies for permanent holdings. It was also keenly regretted that the improved relations that have grown up between all classes in consequence of their co-operation in combating the famine will be seriously affected by this legislation, which the cultivators regard as an expedient for relieving the Government of its promises to make adequate suspensions and remissions of land revenue. The meeting earnestly besought the Government to abandon the proposed legislation."

This telegram was reproduced in the columns of many British journals, and was made the subject of comment in leading articles.

Reuter's Bombay correspondent telegraphed (July 29) as follows:—"A large public meeting of Natives of Bombay has been held here for the purpose of making representations to the Government on the state of public feeling in the Presidency regarding the Land Revenue Code Amendment Bill, and the necessity of giving sufficient time for discussion and criticism."

The "Manchester Guardian" wrote in its leading columns (July 30):—"That hundreds of Native delegates from all parts of the Bombay Presidency should have assembled in Bombay on Saturday to protest against the new Land Revenue Code Amendment Bill shows the uneasiness which has been caused by this proposal of the Bombay Government. The chief purpose of the Bill is to withdraw from the peasant proprietors the right of alienating their holdings, so as to prevent the displacement of the cultivators, or rather their transformation into tenants at will, by the money-lenders, into whose clutches so many of them have fallen. A very similar measure was enacted last year for the Punjab after a long controversy in which Native opinion was almost entirely adverse to the Government. The opposition of the Natives to the Bombay Bill is still more pronounced, not only because it affects a far larger population, but also because it is regarded, rightly or wrongly, as an evasion of the Bombay Government's promise partially to suspend or remit the land tax, so as to enable the peasantry, crippled by three years of famine, to make a fresh start. The Government, it is thought, instead of proposing by so drastic a measure to save the Bombay peasant from the money-lender, who has helped him through the bad years, ought rather to assist him by moderating its own demands, by establishing land banks, and by promoting the growth of manufacturing industries to relieve the pressure of the surplus population upon the soil. In any case, whatever the theoretical merits of the Bill may be, one may question the political expediency of passing a measure which excites widespread alarm and mistrust among the peasantry for whose benefit it is intended."

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

556,000 ON RELIEF.

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy, dated July 27:—

"Famine. Prospects have improved by light and uncertain but general rain, much below the average, but it is sufficient for the present except in the case of Deccan, Gujerat, West Punjab, and in part of Central India and Rajputana, where sowing operations have been retarded. No general injury as yet. Prices do not indicate apprehension.

"In Bombay numbers on works have decreased by 39,000 and number on gratuitous relief increased 6,000. June death-rate per mille affected districts below 2, except in the case of Ahmednagar, where it is 2.31. Physical condition of the people reported to be generally satisfactory except in part of Ahmednagar and Sholapur, where some deterioration still apparent.

"Number of persons in receipt of relief:—Bombay, 461,000; Bombay Native States, 42,000; Baroda, 30,000; Hyderabad, 10,000; Madras, 3,000; Central India States, 6,000; Central Provinces, 4,000; total, 556,000."

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

LAND ASSESSMENTS AND MIDDLEMEN.

SIR,—Having before me the text of Mr. S. S. Thorburn's paper, "Agricola Redivivus," in the "Asiatic Quarterly Review," and your own report (June 28) of the discussion thereon—for which I consider your readers ought to be grateful—and having sat through that debate, I beg to send you the following afterthoughts on the whole matter:—

1. Is it not high time to have brought within manageable compass the hundred years' controversy round about the question—Land in India: Whose it is? or to whom pertains the "produit net" thereof, and what persons or classes can rightly claim (unearned) shares therein, by equity, prescription, or in virtue of the public welfare? Seeing that a century has not availed to bring this vast and much-vexed problem into tangible compass so as to make it intelligible to the wayfaring man, it might seem vain to hope that the combined experience and acumen of Mr. Thorburn and his reviewers could bring us within measurable distance of such a long desired haven. And, yet, amidst all the garnered counsel, of which this Thorburn-cum-Courtney symposium represents the latest phase, there may be certain fibres or links leading us, as regards this very practical problem, towards one of those "landing places" such as Coleridge considered he had found even in climbing the rugged steeps of metaphysic philosophies.

2. But you need not expect me to define or describe such landing place in the Indian land problem as, reckoning time by years of brain-expenditure, ought in this first year of the new century to be coming within reach. No, my part in this evolution is a more humble one. Having, as a watchman and through wireless telegraphy, been enabled to apprise the weary disputants aforesaid that they may soon arrive at a broad plateau where they can take breath and look round, my immediate duty is to indicate certain pitfalls and boulders they have yet to avoid or outflank. On turning to your record for this purpose I found it so voluminous that it can only be dealt with by way of using the monitory legend which clerks in India are wont to append at the foot of their statements of account—e.o.e.—that is, "errors and omissions excepted." So let us take a single error to begin with, and it is a big one, by this time all but ineradicable. It runs through the present record from the experienced Mr. Thorburn himself, up to (on the other side of it) the "Progressive Viceroy" himself. The keynote of this pervasive error is struck in a passage that occurs in the early part of Mr. Thorburn's paper, and yet a corrective is implied in the latter part of it, thus: "at that time (just after our annexing the Punjab) and for some years afterwards, the conception of individual property in land hardly existed . . . . the community, not the individual, was the occupying unit." Just so; that erroneous "conception" did not exist, because it is not Indian, nor is it a true economic factor anywhere. It was, and is, merely a popular English notion—foisted on our own agricultural custom by successive political and plutocratic usurpations. To this rooted error having been thrust into and upon the Indian social-economic compact may be traced half the woes and most of the confusion amidst which our Indian administrators are struggling, and beneath which the cultivator, whose toil supports the whole, is, as we see, being crushed to the dust. The inveterate nature of this error, that there should or can be "individual property in land," may be illustrated by reference to two very different disputants in this much mixed debate. For

instance, Mr. Romesh C. Dutt, in contending for what he vaguely speaks of as the cultivators' "customary right"—to mortgage up to the hilt their occupancy interest and right or alienate it altogether—goes on to protest against "saving the cultivators by confiscating their rights and lowering the value of their property"; and one notes in your columns how now and again this Bengal Civilian authority speaks of the rayat's occupancy right as "his only property on earth."

3. In passing, one may wonder what that new School of Political Economy (sometimes patronisingly mentioned in your columns) would make out of the confusion of terms and directly opposed factors of rights, interests, and obligations traceable in those citations; and those schoolmasters of the Adelphi who profess to deal with the elements of their science would, one may suppose, tell us that no customary or even legalised right of occupancy, i.e., usufructuary interest, can permit of the holder regarding it as personal "property" which he can permanently alienate, barter, or give away; seeing that it is a portion (it may be a tiny fraction) of the public or communal domain with which, on certain terms, he has been entrusted. That this perplexing confusing of the rayat's beneficiary occupancy right with his "personal property" is a crooked thread that runs through all this tangled web may be seen in an incidental remark by that sagacious Punjab Civilian, Sir James Lyall, namely, "it was the limitation of the Government demand for land revenue that turned the property of the cultivators into a valuable security"—grabbed at and schemed for by those persons in every class of the community who "seek to live by the labour of others." But that "security" is not "property" that can be transferred as may a coat or a pony; nor is the margin left by limitation of State demand "the property of the cultivators"; but it is that beneficiary interest in the soil they till, that immemorial perdurable consuetudinary right of the rayat as such— the one clear, firm, inalienable economic basis of the Indian agricultural compact. All else—usurers, "free contract," from "the Rawalpindi millionaire" to the swarm of local peddling village traders; middlemen of sorts, grand though unproductive zemindars, idle talukdars, squeezing mulguzars; nay, even the impersonal disinterested claim of the State, the superior trustee—are all as "wood, hay, or stubble" compared with the cultivator's right to a "living" margin, the saving bond of Indian social polity.

4. Now, just a passing remark or two touching the other end of the skein of error—Mr. Thorburn's assenting citation—"We are" (as Lord Curzon recently reminded his Council) "in the strictest sense of the word, the largest landlords in creation." Here the obvious gibe occurs, the globe might have served as limitation of His Excellency's survey; for there may even be bigger landlords in Jupiter, and it would be cold comfort for us to know that original sin has carried the secular evil of landlordism into Saturn. No: his lordship was not then glancing through space; rather was he thinking of his brief pleasant interview, soon after his arrival, with those English-invented landlords, the Bengal zemindars, who, through their standing organisation, the British Indian Association, sought to elicit from the new ruler the assurance that whatever else might happen their "rights" shall be secured. His response was all they could desire. The Lord of Kedleston and Scarsdale-Kensington ground rents at once recognised these privileged consumers of "unearned increment" as a newly-found band of brothers. And he went off into a description of our sacred English land system (Disraeli's three profits included), which, as your readers may remember, was in every point dissimilar and contrary to the true agricultural economy of India. Mr. Thorburn himself was incautious when he cited, as if it were an accepted principle, the too common popular generalisation—"From ancient times each ruler of the day had regarded himself as the sole and universal landlord entitled to exact from agriculturists as much of the produce as it was politic or possible to take." No; neither Rajas nor Emperors were ever so "entitled"; and their Dewans or other advisers were always aware of the sacred and political limitations in bar of that absolute claim. No doubt those reservations were constantly disregarded by greedy and reckless rulers or their parasites: but whence came the splendid architectural memorials and canals in Northern India, the reservoirs, anicuts and tanks in Southern India, if not from the sovereigns' surplus produce of the land?

5. Having thus detected and exposed one large "error excepted" in the great debate on "Land in India: Whose it is?" let me refer, as another exception, to one huge omission. The gap it presents to one who looks below the surface may be perceived through this little chink in Mr. Thorburn's paper:—"As coined money was still [and always is] scarce with [Indian] peasants." That is, how is it that the Indian rayat is always so short of rupees that when his assessment has to be paid he is compelled to borrow regardless of terms or cost? None of the whole college of disputants, from the flamboyant champion of the Southern Satrapy to the shrewd and ever thoughtful chairman, seemed inclined to attempt any explanation of this fiscal and monetary side of the controversy—though it be "as gross and palpable as a mountain." With your readers mere mention of the omission suffices to show the missing link in the debate. It has often been set out in your invaluable journal, and its pitiless bearing on the Indian producers' condition carefully described. Here it is in a single line—though it would require an essay to make it plain to the purblind optimists of the day: it is that a very large proportion of the rayats' revenue-yielding products are drawn out of the country, and the money value thereof is disbursed on the other side of the globe. Here let me give you two or three concise lines of statistics worth columns of exposition: the figures are taken, not from the last issue of the "Explanatory Memorandum," but from that of 1899-1900, before the totals were fudged as since by use of the Dawkins sham "pounds."

	Rx.
Land Revenue 1899-1900 (pp. 28-9) - - - -	27,641,900
Deduct charges in respect of collection (most of this remaining in India) - - - - - -	4,209,400
	23,432,500
Equivalent of Sterling Expenditure in England charged on the (Indian) Revenues of the year (p. 18)	24,875,400

Some of your readers may be able to trace, step by step, the operation of this perennial suction from Westminster until its exhausting pull reaches the rayat, depriving him of the "living" margin of rupees which his beneficiary occupancy right would otherwise permit him to spend and thrive upon. Possibly those few who pondered on my two former letters will say I am here going out of my beat. Well, there may be time hereafter to go back on details as to which fractions of the assessment are too high, and how the usurers and middlemen can be kept at bay.—Yours, etc.,

SENEX.

Unaowhar, July 31.

RECEPTION TO DR. MULLICK.

PRESENTATION OF HIS PORTRAIT.

A complimentary "At Home" was held on Monday, July 29, at St. Ermin's Hotel, Westminster, to meet Dr. Sarat K. Mullick, on the occasion of his intended tour round the world. A large number of ladies and gentlemen were present, including the Princess Paleologue of Greece, Baroness Gudin, Baron and Baroness von Horst, the Countess of Eldon, Lady Macfarren, Lady Clark, Miss Naoroji, Miss Palit, and Miss Beata Fuller, Sir Richard Temple, Sir Alfred C. Lyall, Sir John Jardine, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Count Bathyani, Sir James Rivett Carnac, Bart., General Sir Julius Raines, V.C., Mr. J. M. Parekh, Mr. L. Palit, Mr. J. S. Cotton, Mr. W. Martin Wood, Mr. Arthur Symonds, and Mr. William Digby.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. A. Das), having read letters of regret from Sir W. Wedderburn, Mr. C. E. Schwann, M.P., and Mr. W. S. Caine, M.P., said the Organising Committee had arranged the gathering as a mark of appreciation of the work done by Dr. Mullick for India, and the services rendered by him to science. His family had been employed in the service of the country for many generations. The Mullicks were intimately connected with the households of Indian Emperors, who conferred on them the title of "Malik" (commander), which has since become their name. During the South African War India had not been behindhand in offering to share in the defence of the Empire. Dr. Mullick offered his services, but for some reason or other they were not accepted. For the last four generations, some member or other of the family has honourably occupied the Judicial Bench. During the dark days of the Indian Mutiny, it is not generally known in this country, loyal Natives of India saved many British lives; and an ancestor of Dr. Mullick's was one of those who proved true to their salt. At considerable risk he sheltered many Englishmen and English women—(cheers); and he was rewarded by the Government for his services. Though a comparatively young man, Dr. Mullick had already done much to advance the interest of his countrymen. He had been a harbour of refuge for Indians in difficulty in London. His countrymen in London were proud of him, because, as an Indian, the product of English education, he had carved out for himself a most successful career in England. He was one of the London representatives to the International Congress on Medicine, and he represented India at the Congress on Tuberculosis, held in London last week. If sympathy cured illness, then Dr. Mullick must be doubly successful. Mr. Das then called upon Sir Richard Temple to present to Dr. Mullick a portrait of the doctor himself, the work of the gifted and rising artist, Miss Beata Fuller. (Loud cheers.)

Sir RICHARD TEMPLE, who was received with applause, said: I have been asked by the Bengal residents in London to present to Dr. Mullick his portrait on their behalf. You will see that it is a good portrait of the Doctor, and that the fair artist has caught the expression. I congratulate you on having Dr. Mullick as a fellow citizen in the Metropolis of the British Empire. (Cheers.) Dr. Mullick, as you all know, is well known in University annals, and he took a very high degree. He has actually succeeded in establishing a practice in London, which is a remarkable thing considering the great European competition that exists. I see before me men of learning who will know how close the competition is, and who can judge what a triumph it is for Dr. Mullick that he has established a practice—I believe a very lucrative one. He has also established a position in the learned and scientific part of his profession, and is looked upon as an authority even by many hospitals in London. (Cheers.) He has been a delegate on important occasions on behalf of the scientific faculty to represent them at conferences and such functions. All this constitutes a very remarkable group of circumstances, which I think must be almost unique as yet in the history of Bengal. No doubt, now that a beginning has been made, other Bengalis will follow in his footsteps. (Hear, hear.) Dr. Mullick belongs to a race which I had the honour to govern, for Bengal is one of the provinces which I was set over on behalf of the Crown. (Hear, hear.) It sometimes happens that persons

who are successful forget or despise their humbler brethren. Very much the opposite is the conduct of Dr. Mullick. (Hear, hear.) While he has been winning the esteem of Englishmen, and the respect of the English medical profession and scientific faculty, he has also been securing the affectionate regard of his own fellow-countrymen in London. (Hear, hear.) That redounds to his honour. I have no doubt that it is his kindly nature that has been the secret of his holding so high a place in the regard of all who have met him. I trust I have stated briefly though emphatically and strongly what is in your minds as well as in my own. (Hear, hear.) I hope that Dr. Mullick and all Bengali ladies and gentlemen present will accept our sincere and hearty declaration of goodwill, which we also extend to all people who come from India. (Hear, hear.) It is quite true that we have not always been able to accept the loyal services so honourably, generously, and patriotically offered by Natives of India during recent years, owing to political considerations; but for all that, the fact that this loyalty was shown will tend to raise the British Empire in the estimation of all nations. (Cheers.) It should be remembered that at a time of strain and difficulty India from her own garrison spared a whole Army Corps for service in South Africa and China. (Loud applause.) In reference to the Bengalis themselves, their province has a population which has always been regarded as among the quietest, best-behaved, and most faithful of all the many nationalities included within the limits of India, and it is for one of the most distinguished and skilful members of that vast community that I now ask for your kindliest regard and your best wishes, while, on behalf of the Bengalis in London, I present to him this portrait. (Loud applause.)

Mr. Naoroji, who was loudly cheered on rising, said he was very glad to be present, because he recognised the great worth of Dr. Mullick, who possessed all the qualities required by leaders of men. The younger generation had a great work before them, and he hoped Dr. Mullick would prove a blessing to his country. (Cheers.)

Sir John Jardine said it was well that they had meetings like the present one in order that the world and England should get some notion of what our fellow-subjects in India really were. They had before them the living embodiment of an Indian gentleman. (Cheers.) He thought that the more the people of India were met the more their qualities were appreciated. He was certain they would all join in wishing Dr. Mullick a long and successful career whether under the gloomy skies of London or in the delightful Eastern land from which he hailed. (Loud cheers.)

Sir Alfred Lyall said he could only subscribe to what had already been so well expressed by previous speakers in adding his testimony to the general estimate of the worth and value of Dr. Mullick. He thought that two countries could claim Dr. Mullick—the country in which he was born and bred, and the country which had given such remarkable scope for his great powers of intellect. He hoped he would take up the question of the arrangements which should be made for Indian students whom we welcomed in London. If he did that, and persuaded his countrymen also to take up the question, he would be doing a great service to both countries. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. W. Digby said he counted it a great privilege to associate himself with what had been said in regard to Dr. Mullick. The fact that he had come to England and worked himself to the position which he now occupied was the highest possible testimony that could be placed to his credit. Dr. Mullick had shown both energy and strength of character, and had won their highest esteem.

Dr. Mullick, who was cordially received, said: I feel somewhat overwhelmed at having to reply to the flattering words which have been used in regard to me. I can assure you all that I appreciate very deeply the kind and hearty way in which you have received me, but I cannot adequately thank you for your kindness. I shall take the words which have been spoken of me with me wherever I go, for they are the most encouraging words that I have had addressed to me during my career. Indians do their very best to win the affection and esteem of English people, and, if I may say so, from my own personal experience in India, there is among the overwhelming number of English people there an equal desire to win the same of their Indian fellow subjects. (Hear, hear.) You have shown me the greatest kindness which I could possibly receive. I belong to another race and to another country, but when I came to England I found myself among friends. I have been asked whether I love India or England best, and I confess I have been at considerable loss to know which I do really love most. So much kindness has been shown me by Englishmen that I feel myself absolutely at home here. I have to thank you all for your kindness. The people of India are getting English ideas and English education, and they are coming in large numbers to England, and are carrying with them back to India scientific and literary attainments of the greatest worth. Indians are deeply grateful for all you have taught them. The question as to how we can help our younger Indian countrymen who come to England has received my attention even from my student days, and I hope we shall be able to befriend them. You have conferred upon me a most signal mark of honour, and I thank you from the bottom of my heart. Though I am going away for a few months, I hope to return among you again. (Hear, hear.) I hope I shall be of some service to the Empire in order to repay to some extent the kindness extended to me. (Loud applause.)

Mr. G. K. Gadgil, on behalf of the guests, thanked the Organising Committee, and especially Mr. A. Das, for the arrangements for the evening's reception. Refreshments were then served, and a musical programme followed.

INDIAN TEA COMPANIES.

"The history of the tea industry in India has been a very chequered one, alternating between periods of great prosperity and the deepest depression, and it may, therefore, be hoped that the present crisis, which seems to be generally attributed to over-production, may in its turn be succeeded by a renewed period of prosperity."—"Sir Edward Law's Financial Statement" for 1901-02.

The reports of these [Indian Tea] companies for the past year (says the "Investors' Review," July 27) are depressing reading. Not a single board of directors is able to avoid alluding to the depreciation which has taken place in the price of tea, and nearly all complain of over-production, of the increase in the tea duty, and some confess that for one reason or another the quality of the leaf last year was not quite up to the average. Whether that is so or not prices were certainly poorer, and the return to shareholders far from comfortable. . . . . From every point of view, therefore, the record of the past year is disappointing.

We are not sure that the directors of the companies are altogether right in blaming the increased supply, the fall in prices, or the raised English import duty for their misfortunes. It may be, as a correspondent of the Calcutta newspaper, "Capital," insists, that the management of the estates has something to do with this untoward result, and in some instances, as we have often pointed out, the hurry to make extensions at high capital cost, and the extravagant prices paid for gardens taken over by the newer class of companies lie at the root of the non-success. Yet is it true that the production of tea has been increasing to an extent which has tended to glut the market everywhere. It is stated in the report of the Balijan Tea Company that during the past season about 25,500,000 lb. of tea were received from India and Ceylon in excess of 1889, and about 44,500,000 more than in 1898. There was no room for all this extra quantity of leaf, and inevitably prices receded. There is consequently hardly a company in our list which has been able to obtain anything like the same price as in previous years for its tea, and the decline in good common teas has been progressive for a number of years. The gross average price per pound realised on fine Indian tea has fallen from 10.86d. in 1894 to 9.22d. in 1900, and the fall has been almost uninterrupted. This applies to the results obtained by the Jokai, whose teas are of a superior quality, and it has not been possible to reduce the cost of production to the same extent. Some cruel or foolish managers or agents have tried to cheapen production by starving the coolie, but that does not pay. Companies producing poorer teas, the selling price of which ranges from 5d. to 6d., naturally suffer to a greater extent than the high grade companies, and the position has become so serious that, as our readers know, an attempt was made some time ago to organise a restriction of output. The plucking was to be limited not only in order to reduce the quantity of leaf sent to market, but to improve its quality. Nothing definite came of this proposal, and we doubt if anything can come of it. The position of not a few companies is such, owing to their capital commitments, as to compel them to gather every leaf they dare and hurry all the product forward to market to sell for what it will fetch. Either they are too hard up, or it pays the agent to do a big trade. Were all the tea-producing companies in India and Ceylon in the position of some of the best amongst them, it might have been comparatively easy to slow down for a few seasons until the market was restored to health; but, as matters stand, this is practically impossible. No restrictive agreement could be enforced, and the only result would be that weak companies would betray their stronger neighbours and take advantage of the good faith of some to forestall the market. In one respect only does there seem to be some tendency to pause, and that is in the opening up of new ground. Extensions are not being pushed forward as they were, but it will take time for this remedy to have any practical effect, and meanwhile the new plantings of recent years are coming into bearing, so that the output of tea for the current year promises to be the largest on record. . . . . In the present state of the market the attempt to sell increased quantities can only have the effect of further depreciating prices and of increasing the embarrassments of many weak companies.

Are there no new markets to be found for this tea? As was pointed out by a Calcutta correspondent in our columns a fortnight ago, there is a splendid market, or ought to be, in India itself if it were only developed. We are glad to see that Messrs. Andrew Yule and Co. have offered to attempt the opening up of this market in India and that the tea planters appear to be disposed to second their efforts. However successful this attempt may ultimately be it will not save the companies this year, and it seems probable that shareholders will again have to go either without or with diminished dividends. Some companies seem to us to be in an almost hopeless position. They are deeply in debt, either to the agents or to debenture holders undefined, the quality of their tea is poor, and the prices they get for it so low as to leave a loss instead of a profit on the overturn. Charges show no disposition to diminish, but are, on the contrary, apt to increase, and the only people, as the writer in "Capital" already mentioned points out, who year by year profit are the agents. That correspondent utters an emphatic growl against the costs run up by many of the firms who manage these tea properties without guidance or interference by the ornamental boards of directors. There is probably a grievance in this respect, and in some instances, indeed, we know that this must be the case where agents are indifferent, incapable, or unscrupulous. The bulk of the companies, however, are suffering from this drain no more severely now than they have done all along, and it alone would not suffice to destroy those of them possessed of any substance. . . . . The industry has been overdone.

Imperial Parliament.

Tuesday, July 23.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TARIFF FOR TELEGRAMS.

Sir Edward Sassoon asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was able to hold out any expectation of the arrangement for the reduction in the telegraphic tariff to and from India coming into force within a measurable distance of time, which the present President of the Board of Agriculture declared 15 months ago to be all but signed; also, whether the various pooling arrangements to which the Indian Government committed themselves were to continue for an indefinite term of years.

Lord G. Hamilton: The subjects to which my hon. friend's question refers are under the consideration of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Cable Communications. Pending the receipt of their report I am not in a position to make any announcement on these subjects.

THE FRONTIER LINE.

Mr. Herbert Roberts asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would state how far the outpost of Jandola (the scene of the attack made upon a detachment of the 45th Sikhs on the 10th instant) was from Kohat or other nearest position on the administrative frontier of India: Whether that locality was included in the trans-frontier portion of the proposed new province: And, whether, seeing that the presence of Sikh troops was obnoxious to the Moslem tribesmen in those regions, the Government of India would consider the desirability of employing Native troops of a different race as garrisons of such outposts.

Lord G. Hamilton: The nearest important position in British India is Tank headquarters of a sub-division of Dera Ismail Khan, which is about 15 miles from Jandola. The answer to the second question is in the affirmative. The choice of troops must be left to the discretion of the Government of India and the military authorities on the spot, who are fully acquainted with the racial likes and dislikes of the tribes with whom they have to deal.

PENSIONS FOR OFFICERS' WIDOWS AND CHILDREN.

Major Rasch asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could explain why the widows and families of officers of Indian Army Departments (1,341, 1,344 Army List, 1/7/91), all of whom served with the British Army, on promotion to warrant officers should not be treated as regards pensions and allowances similarly to those of officers entering the Staff Corps from the British Army; and, if not, would he have paragraph 1,541, Army Regulations, vol. 1, Pay Code, amended to include them.

Lord G. Hamilton: An Indian Army Circular was issued by the Government of India on the 1st April, 1900, revising the rates of pension for the widows and children of officers and warrant officers of Indian Army Departments. The rates now in force are equivalent to those enjoyed by the widows and children of corresponding ranks in the British Army.

Thursday, July 25.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

On the motion of Sir Seymour King a Return was granted for Copy of a Despatch from the Government of India, dated the 17th day of January 1901, and of the reply thereto of the Secretary of State for India in Council, dated the 7th day of June, 1901, on the subject of Memorials from the Officers of the Public Works Department appointed from the Royal Indian Engineering College in the years 1873-1878.

TRIAL BY JURY.

Mr. Caine asked the Secretary of State for India whether any restrictions were intended to be imposed upon the present system of trial by jury in India; and, if so, whether he would explain to the House the reasons offered for such restrictions; and whether the House would have an opportunity of discussing the matter before a final decision was taken.

Lord G. Hamilton: There is no authority for the allegation in the first question.

THE INDIAN BUDGET STATEMENT.
THE FAMINE COMMISSION REPORT.

Mr. Field asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could give the date upon which the Indian Budget would be discussed.

Lord G. Hamilton: I am unable to name a day for the discussion of the Indian Budget.

Mr. MacNeill: Will the report of the Famine Commission be issued before the Budget is introduced?

Lord G. Hamilton: I do not think it will be possible.

Tuesday, July 30.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

POONA COLLEGE OF SCIENCE.
RESTRICTIONS IN THE ENGINEERING BRANCH.

Mr. Cameron asked the Secretary of State for India if he was aware of certain difficulties in the way of technical instruction and engineering training, caused by the action of the Director of Public Instruction in the Bombay Presidency, whereby several students applying to enter the engineering branch of the College of Science at Poona found themselves excluded: And, having regard to the recent declarations of His Excellency Lord Curzon at the Aligurh College, would he state what steps would be taken for the removal of the restrictions mentioned.

Lord G. Hamilton: I learn from an answer given to a question in the Bombay Legislative Council on the 12th February last that in consequence of the large increase in the number of students in the Engineering Branch of the Poona College of Science since the year 1898-99 it became necessary to limit the admissions in 1901 to 40, and to select those to be admitted by a competitive examination. Neither the accommodation in the College nor the teaching staff is calculated to admit of an indefinite extension of the numbers attending, and the restriction was absolutely necessary to provide for the efficient working of the Institution, which is maintained primarily for the supply of candidates for Government service in the Public Works Department. It is open to private enterprise to provide instruction in Engineering for those who desire it and whom it is impossible to accommodate in the Government College.

GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY.

The House went into Committee on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Loan Bill.

Lord G. Hamilton moved that it is expedient to authorise the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise in the United Kingdom any sum or sums of money, not exceeding £3,220,900, for paying off or redeeming Debentures of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company on the Security of the Revenues of India, and to make provision for the purposes relating thereto. The noble lord explained that the resolution gave effect to the decision of the House last Session. The Indian Government had acquired possession of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, and one of the conditions of purchase was that they should pay off the debentures as they became due.

A division was challenged, and the Committee divided, the numbers being:—

For the resolution	188	
Against	43	
Majority		— 145

The resolution was reported to the House.

Wednesday, July 31.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY.

On the report of the resolution authorizing the raising in this country by the Indian Government of a loan not exceeding £3,220,900 for paying off or redeeming the debentures of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway on the security of the revenues of India, a division was challenged by the Nationalists.

The House divided, and the numbers were:—

For the resolution	221	
Against	53	
Majority		— 168

Lord G. Hamilton then brought up the East India Loan (Great Indian Peninsula Railway Debentures) Bill, which was read a first time. The second reading of the Bill was put down for Thursday.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS.

Notice has been given of the following Questions:—

Mr. Caine,—To ask the Secretary of State for India, if he is now able to say what action he proposes to take with regard to the sum of money lying at the Bank of England to the credit of the Scinde, Punjab, and Delhi Railway, which railway was taken over by the Government of India in 1886.—(Thursday, August 1.)

Mr. Caine,—To ask the Secretary of State for India, if he can state what number of troops, British and Native, of the Indian Army are now on service outside the frontiers of India; at each respective place at which they are stationed; and what troops serving in South Africa are to be withdrawn; and, if so, how soon.—(Thursday, August 1.)

Sir William Anson,—To ask the Secretary of State for India, whether the Board of Visitors of Cooper's Hill College has made any report since representatives of the Universities were added to the Board; and, if so, whether he is prepared to lay the report upon the Table before the discussion of the Indian Budget.—(Thursday, August 1.)

Sir John Kennaway,—To ask the Secretary of State for India what effect has been given by the Local Governments in India to the Government of India's Resolution in the Quinquennial Review of Education, by Mr. J. S. Cotton, published in the "Gazette" of India, November 4, 1899, for the clear determination of the relations between private enterprise and the State.—(Thursday, August 1.)

Mr. Herbert Roberts,—To ask the Secretary of State for India, whether he will state what, up to the end of the year 1900, was the amount of the arrears due from the railway system of India to the general revenues of the country.—(Thursday, August 1.)

NOTICE OF MOTION.

The following Notice of Motion is upon the Order Paper of the House of Commons:—

Sir Edward Sassoon,—East India (Telegraphs),—To call attention to the existing unsatisfactory relations between the Indian Government and the owners of private Cable and Land Lines; and to move a Resolution.—(An early day.)

PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO INDIA.

To be obtained from
THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84-85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Reports of the Proceedings at the Annual Sessions of the Indian National Congress, from the 3rd to the 14th Session. 2s. each, post free.

The Skeleton at the (Jubilee) Feast (Congress Green Book I.), by Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, Bart. (being a series of suggestions for the prevention of famine in India). Post free, 7d.

Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure: Evidence-in-Chief of the Indian Witnesses. (Congress Green Book II.) Post free, 1s. 10d.

The Proposed Separation of Judicial and Executive Functions in India. Memorial to the Secretary of State. With two Appendices. (Congress Green Book III.) Post free, 1s. 2d.

Two Statements presented to the Indian Currency Committee (1898), by Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

Speech by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., in the House of Commons, August 14, 1894, on the Debate on the Indian Budget.
Ditto do. in the House of Commons, February 12, 1895, on the Debate on the Address.
Ditto do. on British Rule in India (1898).

Presidential Address by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Lahore, 1893.

Presidential Address by Mr. A. M. Bose, M.A., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Madras, 1898.

Speeches of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., President of the Indian National Congress, 1894-5.

Valedictory Address of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., delivered at Bombay, January 17, 1895.

Speeches of Mr. D. E. Wacha delivered at the 9th, 11th and 14th Sessions of the Indian National Congress.

Is the Government of India Responsible to Anyone, and if so to Whom? Speech delivered at Croydon by Mr. W. C. BONNERJEE.

The Famine in India. Speeches delivered at a Public Reception to Mr. Vaughan Nash on his return from the Famine Districts, July, 1900.

Mr. A. O. Hume's Farewell to India. Speech delivered at Bombay, 1894.

India Reform Pamphlet IX. The State and Government of India under its Native Rulers. 3d.

The Indian National Congress: its Aims and Justification. By ROBERT KNIGHT.

Indian Politics. A Series of Papers on Important Indian Questions by Prominent Congressmen. Post free, 4s. 4d.

A Needed Reform in the Indian Administration, by ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

The Bogey of a Russian Invasion. A Lesson from the Tirah Campaign, by Col. H. B. HANNA.

The High Courts and the Collector-Magistrates in India, by J. DACOSTA.

The Government of India and its Reform through Parliamentary Institutions, by J. DACOSTA.

Note on Sir J. Westland's Budget, 1894-5.

Note on the Explanatory Memorandum of the Secretary of State for India, 1894-5.

Note on Sir James Westland's Budget, 1895-6.

Note on Sir H. Waterfield's Tables, 1884-5 to 1894-5.

The Poor Man's Lamb: Famine Insurance for the Masses *versus* Exchange Compensation for the Classes.

REPRINTS FROM "INDIA."

The Judiciary and the Executive in India. Interview with Mr. Manomohan Ghose.
The Bombay Government and Higher Education, by the Hon. C. H. Setalved.
A National Famine Grant, Letter from the London Indian Society to Lord Salisbury, 1900.
India and the General Election (1900).
"Melancholy Meanness."
The "Over-population" Fallacy Again.
No National Contribution?
The "Slimness" of the India Office.
"Mainly a Question of Money."

A Selection of the Publications enumerated above will be forwarded to responsible persons or Associations in the United Kingdom for gratuitous distribution, on written application to the British Committee, Indian National Congress, 84-85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

"THE PEOPLE OF INDIA:
Their Many Merits by Many who have Known Them."

Mr. Alfred Webb's articles reprinted in pamphlet form from "INDIA."

A copy will be sent free on receipt of 1d. stamp to cover postage.

Secretaries of Political Associations, Clubs, Literary Societies, in the United Kingdom may obtain copies for distribution on application.

BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

In India, applications should be addressed to
Mr. HARICHANDRA A. TALCHERKAR,
52, Veronica Street, Bandra, Bombay.

is what its name implies

FEVER DESTROYER,

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.

I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari. Been in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know.
C. E. WOOD, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for a dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. NARSINGA ROW.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.
C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., & 1 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

Omum-Carpoor TRADE MARK

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY,
43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C., AND
27 SECOND LINE BEACH, MADRAS.

THE GRANHAMS, SHELFORD, CAMBRIDGE.

W. A. DOUGLAS RUDGE, B.A., late Scholar and Prizeman of St. John's College, Cambridge, is prepared to take entire charge of a limited number of young Indian gentlemen and to educate them for the University or Public Schools. Special attention paid to Science subjects. Healthy country home four miles from Cambridge. References kindly permitted by Romesh C. Dutt, Esq., C.I.E., and Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq., in London.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Subscription in England:—
August 1 to End of Year (Post free), 4s. 3d.

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2 Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.